

Peru free trade agreement isn't just about politics. It is about what Democrats stand for in terms of policy.

Why should we defeat this bill? We should defeat the free trade agreement that the Bush administration negotiated on behalf of Peru first to protect America's farmers and America's workers. With a \$3 billion trade deficit with Peru already, we have lost knit-wear jobs, we have lost agricultural jobs in onions and asparagus, and the list grows longer. We will only lose more jobs as we did with NAFTA unless you fix the innards of the agreements to stem the outsourcing in the first place.

We should defeat the Peru trade agreement to stand up for the 3 million soon-to-be displaced Peruvian small farmers who will fall victim to the flood of cheap South American imports that will come from adjoining countries because there are no readjustment provisions in the measure, just as there were no readjustment provisions under NAFTA and 2 million Mexican farmers got displaced, many of them fleeing to our country. Where are those 3 million Peruvian farmers supposed to go with no transition provisions in the agreement?

We should defeat the Peru agreement because it does not contain support "Buy America" policies in it. We should defeat the Peru trade agreement because we know the Bush administration cannot be trusted to enforce it. They haven't balanced any trade agreement. There are no accounts that are positive in these trade agreements that have been signed. In fact, this country this year will rack up close to a \$1 trillion trade deficit with the world. The American people are saying stop, fix what is wrong before you do anything more.

Why would we adopt an agreement that will ruin the rain forest and put indigenous peoples at risk? Why would we do that to the Third World when we see demonstrations against the United States already all over Latin America. Wouldn't you think we would stand up for safe foods and safe imports? We know salmonella and other tainted foods are coming our way from Peru because so much of the seafood comes in here. Why don't we fix the inspection procedures before we adopt another free trade agreement that is not free in the end?

Why won't we adopt trade agreements that would ensure that Peruvians will still have access to medicines they need, despite the demands of a large pharmaceutical company? Why don't we stand up for the average person in these agreements?

Why would we support an agreement that is going to cause such hollowing out of Peruvian agriculture that they're going to have to displace that production with increasing coca production and illegal drugs? Why would we support an agreement like that?

We have to stop the perpetuation of the NAFTA model that leaves poverty and imbalance in its wake while failing

to fulfill any promises of benefits to the middle class in either country.

Mr. Speaker, the New Direction Congress must take a new direction on trade, and I urge my colleagues to reject the Bush NAFTA expansion to Peru and support a new trade model that puts the peoples of the Americas first.

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CELEBRATING NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago in the fall of 1986, I found myself sitting on the couch in my medical office in rural south Georgia.

My wife, Nickie, and I had been married a year and we were struggling. I had been through several broken marriages, several episodes of broken relationships and financial problems because I had been living for myself. I'd been living a prideful, sinful, self-centered lifestyle.

And as I sat there trying to figure out what life was all about, I looked at the table beside the couch upon which I sat, and there was a Gideon Bible sitting there, Mr. Speaker. And as I looked at that, I remembered a few weeks before I was watching a professional football game, and as the cameras panned the crowd, there was a banner hanging over a railing up in the stands. And the big banner was there. The gentleman had this big rainbow-type of hair wig on, and the banner said John 3:16. At that time, it piqued my interest. I asked my wife, Nickie, what John 3:16 said, and she didn't know. She wasn't raised in a religious household either. We didn't even have a Bible in our home to find out.

As I sat there in my office that fall trying to figure out life, I picked up the Bible that was on the table beside the couch, and I opened it up and I read John 3:16: For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever shall believe in Him shall not perish but have everlasting life.

I remembered just a few weeks before sitting on a dock and telling my wife that I didn't believe there was any afterlife, that I did not believe that there was a God, that I did not believe that we had anything beyond this life besides just how people remembered us or through our own kids.

But when I read John 3:16 that day, as a scientist, as a medical doctor, my heart was pricked, and I just prayed out and openly and said, God, if you're

real, I want you to come into my life; I want you to show me that you're real. And as a scientist, I had to have proof, and God really came into my life and He has changed my life.

He's given me a stability in life that comes from no other source than having the Lord Jesus Christ as one's own personal Lord and Savior, and I accepted Him that day in November of 1986. My wife was saved independently just a few months after that.

She and I have been married 22 years now. We have a relationship that can come from no other source, from being based in God's inherent word and have learned over the years that the Holy Bible is true, it's literal, and it's God's direction to us. I call it the manufacturer's handbook. It directs every aspect of life.

God ordained three social entities. He ordained the family, He ordained the church, and He ordained government. Romans 13:1 is very clear about that. The Bible gives us instructions on how to live our lives, every aspect of our lives. Each one of those social entities God's given its area of responsibility, its area of authority.

And unfortunately, in our Nation, because of this mistaken idea that we're supposed to have a separation of church and State, the family and the church have abdicated a lot of its duties over to government. But, Mr. Speaker, what we're doing in our society is not according to God's instructions.

In my home, I have two sets of machines, both washer and dryer. One set of machines washes and dries my clothes; the other machine washes and dries my dishes. Mr. Speaker, if we take our dishes and try to wash them in our clothes washers, we're going to have problems.

And that's what we're doing in our society today, Mr. Speaker, is we're trying to do things against God's inherent word. We're trying to live our lives according to what seems right in the eyes of man, but the scripture is very clear about that.

In Proverbs, we read that there is a way that seems right now as a man but its path is the way of death, and it's going to be the death of freedom. It's going to be the death of our society. It's going to be the death of our Republic unless we turn back to what our Founding Fathers very firmly believed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the Constitution as James Madison and company meant it to be. I carry a copy in my pocket. We've left this document, the great Constitution, as James Madison meant it as how we run our government, how we run our lives publicly.

During this time when we're celebrating National Bible Appreciation Week, I call on my colleagues to read the Bible, to read the Constitution, read what our Founding Fathers who were Bible-believing Christians believed, that every aspect of life should follow the dictates of God's inherent Word.